



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,447	11/20/2003	David M. Salcedo	C4-1114	9828
26799	7590	12/23/2005	EXAMINER	
IP LEGAL DEPARTMENT TYCO FIRE & SECURITY SERVICES ONE TOWN CENTER ROAD BOCA RATON, FL 33486			LAI, ANNE VIET NGA	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2636	

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/718,447	SALCEDO ET AL.
	Examiner Anne V. Lai	Art Unit 2636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 44-86 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 44-86 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 45 and 46 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 45 is dependent of claim 46 and claim 46 is dependent of claim 45; this may be from a typing error; suggest change claim 45 to dependent claim 44.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 44-50, 53-55, 56-57, 59, 65-71, 74-76, 77-82, and 85-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Anthony** [US. 6,559,769] in view of **Piccioni** [US. 6,842,774].

In claim 44, **Anthony** discloses a security system comprising at least a video surveillance camera 10, an object recognition system coupled to the camera, a PDA wirelessly coupled to the object recognition system and the camera (on site mobile unit 5 and remote mobile units of law enforcement personnel or subscribers of the system;

the mobile units can be laptop, handheld computer, blackberry, PDA, pager, cell phone; col. 8, lines 37-59; col. 15, lines 20-45; col. 17, line 59 – col. 20, line 30; col. 21 lines 8-67; figs. 1, 6, 7). **Anthony** discloses a plurality of data collection devices (plurality of cameras, hand-operated wand, and badge identification; col. 18, line 25; col. 19, line 16). **Piccioni** teaches a mobile entity device comprising a PDA, a camera, a display and a data collection device (scanner) used by law enforcement officers or various agents for tracking and reporting events (col. 2, lines 13-47). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to insert or integrate the data collection device into the PDA for the convenience of the user having less wired connections and saving space and cost.

In claims 45-46, **Anthony** discloses video recorder for recording video signal in wireless communication (col. 19, line 37; col. 20, line 17; col. 22, line 16).

In claim 47, **Anthony** (col. 11, lines 14-29) and **Piccioni** (col. 2, line 32-47) disclose the PDA comprising a display.

In claims 48-50, **Anthony** discloses cameras directed to surveillance area and object recognition system provides a detection signal in response to an object entering the surveillance area (abstract; col. 17, line 59 – col. 20, line 30; col. 21, line 48- col. 22, line 40).

In claims 53-55, **Anthony** discloses recognition using computer with pop-up display identification of the individual for early warning identification and remedial-triggering purposes (col. 17, line 59-col. 18, line 21); alarm and recording are also disclosed (dialing a phone or calling a pager using PDA; col. 8, lines 37-59). Although

not specify, it would have been obvious, a coded signal must be used for identifying a particular event to call a specific phone or pager.

In claims 56-57 and 59, **Anthony** discloses at least one peripheral device coupled to the network for wireless communication with the PDA; the peripheral device comprises an alarm (col. 11, lines 54-65) or an access control system (home security, col. 16, lines 20-62; airport security, col. 19, lines 20-24).

In claim 65, **Anthony** combined discloses a method for providing security information comprising generating live video of a surveillance area, communicating live video via wireless connection to a PDA (on site mobile unit 5 or remote mobile units of law enforcement agents, controllers or subscribers, figs. 6-7; col. 10, lines 21-43), acquiring non-video data (hand-operated wand, badge identification; col. 18, line 25, col. 19, line 16), and displaying video and non-video information (col. 18, lines 5-8).

In claims 66-71 and 74-76, **Anthony** combined discloses detecting object entry into surveillance area, comparing, recording, displaying recorded video segment at the PDA of particular officers of controllers or subscribers (col. 8, lines 37-59; col. 17, line 59 – col. 20, line 39).

In claims 77-82 and 85-86, **Anthony** combined discloses the method as claimed for the reason stated above.

5. Claims 51-52, 72-73 and 83-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Anthony** and **Piccioni** in view of **Swanson** [US. 5,689,442].

In claims 51-52, 72-73 and 83-84, **Anthony** fails to disclose store only the video segment that matches the stored data and discard video segment that does not

matched the stored data associated with an identified object; **Piccioni** teaches alert can be forwarded or discarded based on criteria rules (col. 4, lines 16-23). **Swanson** teaches event surveillance system that stores only the events identified as events of interest and deletes information that no longer wanted to make room in storage for subsequently captured information (abstract). In light of Swanson teaching, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to storing only the video segment of interest and discard the video segment that is not wanted for saving storage area and therefore reducing cost.

6. Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Anthony** and **Piccioni** in view of **Parameswaran** [US. 2004/0214598].

In claim 58, **Anthony** combined does not disclose metal detector, however, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made a metal detector for weapon detection at airport or various entrance security check is well known as taught by **Parameswaran** (abstract).

7. Claims 60-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Anthony** and **Piccioni** in view of **Yeung** [US. 6,842,652].

In claims 60-64, **Piccioni** teaches data collection devices including a camera and a scanner integrated into a PDA (col. 2, lines 32-47), **Anthony** discloses barcode scanner (hand operated wand; col. 18, line 25) and proximity card detector (badge identification; col. 19, line 16). **Yeung** teaches a data collection device (image capture device) can be insert into an expansion slot of a PDA. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, making the data

collection device integrated into or removable connected to the PDA is a matter of designer choice based on particular application for cost saving purpose.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne V. Lai whose telephone number is 571-272-2974. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am to 6:30 pm, Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hofsass Jeffery can be reached on 571-272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AVL
12/16/05

JEFFERY HOFSSASS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600